

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
AUG 06 2007PTOL-413A (08-04)
Approved for use through 07/31/2008. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 09/643,663 First Named Applicant: Roland Lamer
Examiner: Venal Frenel Art Unit: 3627 Status of Application: Non-Final Rejection

Tentative Participants:

(1) Examiner Venal Frenel (2) Supervisory Examiner Zaender Ryan Florian

(3) Attorney Christopher M. Scherer (4)

Proposed Date of Interview: August 15, 2007 Proposed Time: 2:00 EST (AM/PM)

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) Telephonic (2) Personal (3) Video ConferenceExhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: YES NO

If yes, provide brief description:

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art Ritblitzky/Evans/Cooke	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) Rej. §103	1		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2)			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3)			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4)			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Continuation Sheet Attached					

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner and Supervisory Examiner for their time in interviewing this case.

The Applicant's representative wishes to focus on the Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(e), that combines the Ritblitzky, Evans, and Cooke Jr. references in rejecting claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-11 and 22-31. Specifically, the Applicant's representative wishes to focus on the independent

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.


Christopher M. Scherer
Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

Examiner/SPE Signature

Christopher M. Scherer
Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

50,655

Registration Number, if applicable

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
AUG 06 2007

4142715770

T-934 P.002/002 F-085

06-Aug-07 11:57am From-

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form (Continuation Sheet)

Application No.: 09/543,663

First Named Applicant: Roland Lamer

Examiner: Vanel Frenel

Art Unit: 3627

Status of Application: Non-Final Rej.

Issues to be Discussed (Continued)

Issues	Claims/ Fig. #'s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(5) _____	_____	_____	[]	[]	[]
(6) _____	_____	_____	[]	[]	[]
(7) _____	_____	_____	[]	[]	[]
(8) _____	_____	_____	[]	[]	[]
(9) _____	_____	_____	[]	[]	[]
(10) _____	_____	_____	[]	[]	[]

Continuation of Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

claim 1 for the purposes of this interview.

In the current Office Action, the Examiner cites Ribitzky, column 9, lines 44-67 to column 10, line 59 to teach functionality code segments and the user interface code segments in the independent claim 1, as well as the container application having a pair of user interface layers. However, in the previous Office Action of January 24, 2007 the Examiner indicated in his "Response to Arguments" section that these elements were actually taught in the Evans reference, column 5, lines 11-51, and column 14, lines 1-67. The Examiner utilized this comment to show that Applicant's argument from the previous Office Action of July 19, 2006 was not persuasive as in that Office Action the Examiner relied upon the same Ribitzky citation as the Examiner is relying upon in this Office Action.

The Applicant's representative first would wish to clarify with the Examiners which reference, Ribitzky or Evans, the Examiner is relying upon to teach the functionality code segments and interface code segments, as well as the container application having the pair of user interface layers.

Furthermore, the Applicant's representative will point out that neither the Ribitzky reference nor the Evans reference teaches these elements of the independent claim 1.

In the current Office Action, the Examiner cites Evans, Column 11, lines 32-67 and column 7, lines 1-19 to column 8, line 17 to teach a uniform user interface such that patient data of the functionality code segments of the first and second components are formatted with the same look and feel. The Applicant's representative wishes to illustrate to the Examiners that Evans does not teach such elements.

Once again, the Applicant's representative respectfully wishes to thank the Examiners for their time and attention in advance.

Sheet 2 of 2